

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 25, 30, and 37 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-44 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-18, 20-23, 25-32, 34-39, and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul in view of Cloutier, further in view of Kephart. The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 11, 19, 33, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul in view of Cloutier further in view of Kephart, in view of Sundsted. Paul teaches filtering email messages. Paul's email filter includes inclusion lists identifying e-mail desired by a single user. Cloutier teaches notification and retrieval of electronically stored messages using signature codes. Kephart teaches scanning email messages for undesired transmission or receipt of electronic messages. Sundsted teaches filtering electronic mail using MD5 hash algorithm. Paul, Cloutier, Kephart, or Sundsted do not teach, either singly or in combination, determining whether the message is not a duplicate message "already stored in a message archive" based upon whether the message tag is found in the single shared index file "associated with multiple users" and "storing the message in the message archive" if the message is not a duplicate message as recited in claim 1 as amended. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Paul, Cloutier, Kephart, or Sundsted do not teach, either singly or in combination, storing a message tag in the single shared index file "associated with multiple users" and storing a second message in the message archive if the second message is not a duplicate of a first message "already stored in the message archive," as recited in claim 8 as amended. As such, claim 8 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Paul, Cloutier, Kephart, or Sundsted do not teach, either singly or in combination, comparing a message tag with a list of message tags stored in a single shared index file

“associated with multiple users,” determining that a message is not a duplicate message “already stored in a message archive,” and “means for storing the message in the message archive if the message is not a duplicate message” as recited in claim 15 as amended. As such claim 15 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Paul, Cloutier, Kephart, or Sundsted do not teach, either singly or in combination, a single shared index file “associated with multiple users” and a duplicate checker that determines whether the message is a duplicate message “already stored in a message archive,” wherein “the message is stored in the message archive” if a computed message tag does not match an entry in the single shared index file as recited in claim 21 as amended. As such, claim 21 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 22-29 depend from claim 21 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Paul, Cloutier, Kephart, or Sundsted do not teach, either singly or in combination, storing a message tag in a single shared index file “associated with multiple users” and storing a second message in the message archive if the second message is not a duplicate of a first message “already stored in the message archive,” as recited in claim 30 as amended. As such, claim 30 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 31-36 depend from claim 30 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Paul, Cloutier, Kephart, or Sundsted do not teach, either singly or in combination, a single shared index file “associated with multiple users” and a duplicate checker that indicates to a archive server that a message is a duplicate message “already stored in the archive message store,” wherein if the message is not a duplicate message, the archive server stores the message in the archive message store as recited in claim 37 as amended. As such, claim 37 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 38-44 depend from claim 37 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/21/2006



Jong Andrew H. Park
Registration No. 56,917
V 408-973-2577
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014